UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,577	09/29/2003	Sathyanarayana Nagendra Puttu	50325-0797	5403

29989 7590 10/18/2007
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER
ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/674,577	PUTTU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles E. Anya	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3/ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 June 2007 and 07 August 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-88</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-88</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)
1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-88 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   **Claims 1-4,6,7,9-11,14,16,17-19,21-26,28,29,31-33,36,38-41,43-48,50,51,53-**

55,58,60-63,65-70,72,73,75-77,80,82-85,87 and 88 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,737,518 Grover et al.

4.   As to claim 1, Grover teaches a method for verifying information on a managed

device, comprising: receiving a management request containing one or more values

comprising proposals for a correct value of a managed object of the managed device

("...sends a request..." Col. 1 Ln. 31 – 44, "...an object query request..." Col. 3 Ln. 21 –

35, "...query..." Col. 6 Ln. 30 – 34, "...query command..." Col. 7 Ln. 57 – 63); wherein

the management request requests a determination as to whether any of the one or

more values match the correct value managed object of the managed

device/determining whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of

the managed object ("...examining..." Col. 1 Ln. 31 – 44, "...test signal..." Col. 3 Ln. 21

– 35, Col. 3 Ln. 48 – 55, Col. 6 Ln. 19 – 25); and completing execution of the

management request by: transmitting a notification message indicating whether any of

the one or more values match the correct value of the managed object ("...message

indicating an error..." Col. 1 Ln. 41 – 44, "...failure is reported..." Col. 3 Ln. 8 – 11,

"...an error is returned..." Col. 6 Ln. 39 – 45).

5.   As to claim 2, Grover teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the management

request is a SNMP request ("...query..." Col. 6 Ln. 30 – 34), and wherein the managed

object is a SNMP MIB object ("...MIB..." Col. 1 Ln. 17 – 30, MIB..." Col. 6 Ln. 30 – 34).

6.   As to claim 3, Grover teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the notification

message identifies which one of the one or more values match the correct value of the

SNMP MIB object ("...message indicating an error..." Col. 1 Ln. 41 – 44, "...failure is

reported..." Col. 3 Ln. 8 – 11, "...an error is returned..." Col. 6 Ln. 39 – 45).

7.   As to claim 4, Grover teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the SNMP request

conforms to any of SNMP version 1, SNMP version 2, or SNMP version 3 ("...query..."

Col. 6 Ln. 30 – 34).

8.   As to claim 6, Grover teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein a specification for

the SNMP MIB object is not generally available ("...valid value..." Col. 6 Ln. 39 – 45,

"...attribute read-write..." Col. 8 Ln. 16 – 21).

9.   As to claim 7, Grover teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the SNMP MIB

object stores an attribute for a protocol other than SNMP ("...NEST network protocol..."

Col. 8 Ln. 60 – 67, Col. 11 Ln. 56 – 67).

10.   As to claim 9, Grover teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the determining

step results in determining that none of the one or more values match the correct value

of the SNMP MIB object ("...examining..." Col. 1 Ln. 31 – 44, "...test signal..." Col. 3 Ln.

21 – 35, Col. 3 Ln. 48 – 55, Col. 6 Ln. 19 – 25), and wherein the transmitting step

comprises transmitting a notification message that includes an error message that

describes an encountered problem in determining whether the one or more values

match the correct value of the SNMP MIB object ("...message indicating an error..."

Col. 1 Ln. 41 – 44, "...failure is reported..." Col. 3 Ln. 8 – 11, "...an error is returned..."

Col. 6 Ln. 39 – 45).

11.   As to claim 10, Grover teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the notification

message is transmitted using SNMP ("...message indicating an error..." Col. 1 Ln. 41 –

44, "...failure is reported..." Col. 3 Ln. 8 – 11, "...an error is returned..." Col. 6 Ln. 39 –

45).

12.   As to claim 11, Grover teaches a method as recited in Claim 2, wherein the

SNMP request is an SNMP GET request "...an object query request..." Col. 3 Ln. 21 –

35, "...query..." Col. 6 Ln. 30 – 34, "...query command..." Col. 7 Ln. 57 – 63, "...object

query requests..." Col. 11 Ln. 56 – 60).

13.   As to claim 14, Grover teaches the method as recited in Claim 2, wherein the

transmitting step comprises the step of storing, in a specified MIB object of the

managed device, a notification value indicating whether any of the one or more values

match the correct value of the SNMP MIB object ("...report...stored in a file..." Col. 8

Ln. 1 – 9).

14.   As to claims 16,23,38,45,60,67 and 82, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

15.   As to claims 17,25,39,47,61,69 and 83, see the rejection of claim 3 above.

16.   As to claims 18,28,40,50,62,72 and 84, see the rejection of claim 6 above.

17.   As to claims 19,29,41,51,63,73 and 85, see the rejection of claim 7 above.

18.   As to claims 21,31,43,65,75 and 87, see the rejection of claim 9 above.

19.   As to claims 22,36,44,53,58,66,80 and 88, see the rejection of claim 14 above.

20.   As to claims 24,46 and 68, see the rejection of claim 2 above.

21.   As to claims 26,48, and 70, see the rejection of claim 4 above.

22.   As to claim 32,54 and 76, see the rejection of claim of claim 10 above.

23.   As to claim 33,55 and 77, see the rejection of claim 11 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

24.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

25.   Claims 5,27,49 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,737,518 Grover et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No.

6,324,646 B1 to Chen et al.

26.   As to claim 5, Grover teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the one or more

values are stored in the SNMP request in a VarBind portion.

        Chen teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the one or more values are stored

in the SNMP request in a VarBind portion (figure 2 Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 5, Col. 6 Ln. 44 - 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the system of Grover with the teaching of Chen because

the teaching of Chen would improve the system of Grover by providing a process and

system for protecting confidential data the may be retrieved from databases within a

computer network (Chen Col. 2 Ln. 48 – 51).

27.   As to claims 27,49 and 71, see the rejection of claim 5 above.

28.   Claims 8,20,30,42,52,64,74 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,737,518 Grover et al. in view of

WhitePaper: IronShield Best Practices Hardening Foundry Routers & Switches to

Kwan.

29.   As to claim 8, Grover is silent with reference to the method of Claim 2, wherein

the SNMP MIB object stores a username or a password for one member of the following

group consisting of: a telnet protocol, a SSH protocol, a TFTP protocol, a RCP protocol,

a SNMP protocol, a TACACS protocol, and a RADIUS protocol.

Kwan teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the SNMP MIB object stores a

username or a password for one member of the following group consisting of: a telnet

protocol, a SSH protocol, a TFTP protocol, a RCP protocol, a SNMP protocol, a

TACACS protocol, and a RADIUS protocol (pages

16,23,27,28,31,34,36,37,41,44,45,50,53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Grover with the teaching of Kwan because the teaching of Kwan would improve the system of Grover by providing basic access security so as to protect devices against unauthorized access and usage (Kwan page 14).

30.   As to claim 20,30,42,52,64,74 and 86, see the rejection of claim 8 above.

31.   Claims 12,13,34,35,56,57,78 and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,737,518 Grover et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,363,421 B2 to Barker et al.

32.   As to claim 12, Grover is silent the method as recited in Claim 2, wherein the SNMP request is an SNMP GETNEXT request.

Grover teaches the method as recited in Claim 2, wherein the SNMP request is an SNMP GETNEXT request ("...GET/ GET-NEXT packets..." Col. 33 Ln. 4 – 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Grover with the teaching of Barker because the teaching of Barker would improve the system of Grover by allowing for the retrieval a value of the next OID in the tree.

33.   As to claim 13, Barker teaches the method as recited in Claim 2, wherein the

SNMP request is an SNMP GETBULK request (GETBULK Col. 32 Ln. 54 – 67, Col. 33

Ln. 8 – 15).

34.   As to claim 34,56 and 78, see the rejection of claim 12 above.

35.   As to claims 35,57 and 79, see the rejection of claim 13 above.

36.   Claims 15,37,59 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,737,518 Grover et al. in view of U.S. Pub. No.

20030131096 A1 to Goringe et al.

37.   As to claim 15, Grover is silent with reference to the method of Claim 2, wherein

the SNMP MIB object stores information about a prompt.

        Goringe teaches the method of Claim 2, wherein the SNMP MIB object stores

information about a prompt ("...prompt..." page 1 paragraph 0004).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the system of Grover with the teaching of Goringe

because the teaching of Goringe would improve the system of Grover by providing a

process for enter commands through the Telnet program that will be executed as if

there were been entered directly on a server console.

38.   As to claims 37,59 and 81, see the rejection of claim 15 above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 6/29/07 and 8/7/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues in substance that the Grover prior art does not teach sending or receiving a management request comprising proposed values of an object and does not teach determining or verifying whether any of any proposal value match the correct value of a managed object in a managed device.

Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's arguments:

As to point (1), contrary to Applicant's assertion the Grover prior art does teach sending or receiving a management request comprising proposed values of an object and determining or verifying whether any proposal value match the correct value of a managed object in a managed device. One of the numerous embodiments of this invention is that a user can specify a certain type of object to test, and the method according to this invention will automatically identify each object of the requested type of object to be tested, and will automatically identify the attributes of each of the objects. Test signals for testing the identified attributes will be generated and communicated over the network to the object management system and responses to the test signals will be **analyzed for correctness**. The test signals generated as a result of user specifying type of object to be tested is a query command or request (sending a management request) communicated over a network to an object management system

and the attributes associated with the object and included in the test signal (query

command or request) is the proposed value of the object. The analyzing (testing) for

correctness of the test signal (query command or request) including the attributes in the

object management system is the determining or verifying whether any proposal value

match the correct value of a managed object in a managed device

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Charles E. Anya whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3757. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Charles E Anya
Examiner
Art Unit 2194

cea.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER